

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY
(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing

(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/JP2004/019287

International filing date (day/month/year)
16.12.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)
08.01.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
G06F1/00

Applicant
MATSUHITA ELECTRIC INDUSTRIAL CO., LTD.

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2
NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas
Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl
Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016

Authorized Officer

Segura, G

Telephone No. +31 70 340-4874



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/JP2004/019287

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 - ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - ☐ in written format
 - ☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	1-22
	No: Claims	23
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-23
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-23
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Re Item V

**Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1. Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: US 2003/048907 A1 (NAKAHARA TOHRU ET AL) 13 March 2003 (2003-03-13)
D2: US 2002/012432 A1 (ENGLAND PAUL ET AL) 31 January 2002 (2002-01-31)
D3: EP-A-1 378 811 (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) 7 January 2004 (2004-01-07)
D4: US-A-5 765 152 (ERICKSON ET AL) 9 June 1998 (1998-06-09)
D5: WO 03/096136 A (PROTEXIS INC; ALDIS, DAVID; KEJSER, BRIAN;
MUECKE, INNES; RIEBE, HENNI) 20 November 2003 (2003-11-20)

2. The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 1, 9, 15, 19 and 22 does not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT, for the following reasons:

The subject-matter of claim 1 addresses two aspects:

- 1.- the conversion of license formats in a content distribution system.

[license management server includes a first license generation unit operable to generate, in a first format, a first license for controlling content use in the terminal device, the relay server includes a second license generation unit operable to generate, in a second format, a second license; the second format being different from the first format; the terminal device includes a format conversion unit operable to obtain the second license from the relay server and convert a format of the second license into the first format]

- 2.- securing the integrity of a license in a content distribution system.

[to generate, in a second format, a second license by adding, to the first license, modification detection information for detecting a modification of the first license; the

terminal device includes a judgment unit operable to judge presence or absence of the modification of the first license whose format is converted by the format conversion unit; and a use unit operable to use the content according to the first license in the case where the judgment unit judges that no modification is made]

The first aspect (conversion of license formats) is well-known in the art as acknowledged by the applicant on page 2 lines 17-25 of the description, and also present on document D1 (paragraph 159). So that devices that convert a license format into a different license format are common in the art.

It is to note that even if the applicant argues that a reversing format conversion is performed in claim 1 it cannot be considered inventive because: in an indirect transmission between 2 units involving 1 or more relay units and the units transmitting in different formats it would be obvious for the skilled person in the network transmissions field to perform a format conversion at the destination unit when the destination unit receives information from a relay unit in a format that it cannot directly process.

The second aspect (securing the integrity of a license) represents a common security procedure in the art for guaranteeing the integrity of data, see for example document D2 (paragraph 138). So that servers that add a modification detection information (e.g. digital signature) to a license and terminal devices that check the modification detection information of a license in order to determine if they can render content associated to the license are well-known in the art.

Moreover, the technical features related to each of these two aspects are not producing any non-obvious working inter-relationship and thus are considered as being juxtaposed.

Therefore claim 1 of the present application does not involve an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT).

- 2.1 The same reasoning applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to the subject-matter of the corresponding independent claims 9, 15, 19 and 22, which therefore are also

considered not inventive.

3. The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of independent claim 23 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT because D3 discloses on pages 19 and 20 the same claimed data structure of claim 23.
4. Dependent claims 2-8, 10-14, 16-18 and 20-21 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of inventive step, see documents D1-D5 and the corresponding passages cited in the search report.